

United States Patent and Trademark Office

CNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Bret 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/867,462	05/31/2001	Toshiya Matsubara	209194US0	6882
22850	7590 07/30/2004	EXAMINER		INER
OBLON, SI	PIVAK, MCCLELLAND,	TRAN, THAO T		
1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
ALEXANDE	(In, VA 22514		1711	
			DATE MAILED: 07/30/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	09/867,462	MATSUBARA ET AL.				
•	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Thao T. Tran	1711				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
THE REPLY FILED 06 July 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.						
PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]						
a) \square The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).						
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if imely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>10 May 2004</u> . Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.						
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:						
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);						
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);						
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or						
(d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.NOTE: .						
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):						
 4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 						
5. The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the						
application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . 6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly						
raised by the Examiner in the final rejection. 7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an avalenation of how the new or amended element would be rejected in available to the last and an avalenation of how the new or amended element would be rejected in available to the last and an avalenation of how the new or amended element would be rejected.						
explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,3-5 and 7-20</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
B. ☐ The drawing correction filed on is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.						
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen	t(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)					
10. Other:	· , , _					

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The Final rejection still stands. As pointed out in the Final rejection of 12/09/03, process limitations with respect to the measurement of a constituent would have insignificant patentable weight in a claim directed to a product or method of making. Moreover, since Kawachi teaches the same hollow glass microsphere, Kawachi's microsphere would inherently have the same properties as the presently claimed invention. For example, if an eluted amount o boron in Kawachi's was to be measured by the recited method, it would have given the same results.

James J. Seidleck Supervisory Patent Examiner Technology Center 1700